Case 3:23-cv-01996-VC Document 147-35 Filed 01/07/25 Page 1 of 5

# EXHIBIT 33

#### GIBBS LAW GROUP LLP

1111 Broadway, Suite 2100 Oakland, California 94607

Telephone: (510) 350-9713 Facsimile: (510) 350-9701 dmb@classlawgroup.com

Norman E. Siegel (pro hac vice)
J. Austin Moore (pro hac vice)
Kasey Youngentob (pro hac vice)
STUEVE SIEGEL HANSON LLP
460 Nichols Road, Suite 200
Kansas City, Missouri 64112
(816) 714-7100 (tel.)
siegel@stuevesiegel.com
moore@stuevesiegel.com
youngentob@stuevesiegel.com

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ABBY LINEBERRY, TERRY MICHAEL COOK and MIGUEL CORDERO, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

VS.

ADDSHOPPERS, INC., and PEET'S COFFEE, INC.,

Defendants.

Case No. 3:23-cv-01996-VC

[PRELIMINARY] PROPOSED VERDICT FORM

### VERDICT 1<sup>1</sup>

Plaintiff claims that AddShoppers violated the California Invasion of Privacy Act. To establish this claim, Plaintiff must prove all of the following:

- 1. That AddShoppers willfully intercepted a communication while it was in transit or being sent or received within the state of California.
- 2. That AddShoppers read or attempted to read or learn the contents or meaning of the communication.
- 3. That AddShoppers did not have consent of all parties to the communication.

On Plaintiff's claim for violations of CIPA against AddShoppers, as submitted in Instruction No, we, the undersigned jurors, find in favor of:
(Plaintiff) OR (Defendant)
Note: Complete the following paragraph only if the above finding is in favor of Plaintiff.
Damages Calculation for CIPA Claim:
The factfinder must award statutory damages of \$5,000 per violation.
Number of violations proven against AddShoppers:
Total damages awarded against AddShoppers: \$
Foreperson
Date:
<u>VERDICT 2</u>
District 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1.

Plaintiff claims that Peet's aided and abetted violations of the California Invasion of Privacy Act. To establish this claim, Plaintiff must prove all of the following:

- 1. That Peet's knew AddShoppers intercepted a communication while it was in transit or being sent or received within the state of California.
- 2. That Peet's gave substantial assistance or encouragement to AddShoppers.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Plaintiffs submit this proposed verdict form to demonstrate that a class action trial on the claims for certification would be easily manageable. They reserve the right to revise or amend this form as the litigation advances.

Note: Complete the following paragraph only if the above finding is in favor of Plaintiff.

(Plaintiff) OR (Defendant)

No. , we, the undersigned jurors, find in favor of:

### **Damages Calculation for CDAFA Claim:**

Compensatory damages:	¢
Compensatory damages.	Φ
	Foreperson
Deter	1
Date:	
	VERDICT 4
	's aided and abetted violations of the Comprehensive Computer establish this claim, Plaintiff must prove all of the following:
That Peet's knew AddS computer system, or com	Shoppers knowingly accessed plaintiff's data on a computer, puter network.
2. That Peet's gave substant	ial assistance or encouragement to AddShoppers.
3. That Peet's conduct was a	a substantial factor in causing harm to Plaintiff.
	nd abetting violations of CDAFA against Peet's, as submitted in the undersigned jurors, find in favor of:
	(Plaintiff) OR (Defendant)
Note: Complete the following pa	ragraph only if the above finding is in favor of Plaintiff.
Damages Calculation for CDA	FA Claim:
Please specify the amoun by Peet's:	t of compensatory damages awarded to Plaintiff for harm caused
Compensatory damages:	\$
	Foreperson
Date:	